



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,000	12/29/2000	Sadao Hirae	P/1596-51	9450
2352	7590	04/13/2005	EXAMINER KORNAKOV, MICHAEL	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/751,000	HIRAE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Kornakov	1746	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Kornakov.

(3) Mr. M. Moskowitz, esq.

(2) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 April 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 9.25 and 33.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The proposed amendment to claims 9, 25 and 33 was discussed. Applicants' attention has been drawn to the fact that the claims as amended recite that "said controller...during the cleaning process, supplies power to said UV lamps to emit ultraviolet light to said cleaning solution forming a puddle on the upper surface of said substrate", thus embracing two different statutory classes of invention, namely a substrate treating apparatus and a cleaning process in the same claim. No prior art was discussed during the interview. .

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036-8403

TEL 212 382 0700 FAX 212 382 0888 FAX 212 398 0681

email@ostrolcnk.com

PARTNERS

SAMUEL H. WEINER
ROBERT C. FABER
MAX MOSKOWITZ
JAMES A. FINDER WILLIAM O.
GRAY, III
LOUIS C. DIUMICH
CHARLES P. LAPOLLA

DOUGLAS A. MIRD
ALFRED B. FABRICANT
LAWRENCE C. DRUCKER

ASSOCIATES

PETER S. SLOAN
MARY G. FONTENOT
JOEL J. FELBER**
BRENDAN J. KENNEDY**
KOURUSH SALEHI**
DOUGLAS Q. HAHN
OLEN R. FARBANTSEH

OF COUNSEL

MARTIN PFEFFER
LEON STYVER*
LAWRENCE A. HOFFMAN
MARTIN J. BERAN
PAUL GRANDINGITTI*
JOSEPH J. ZITO*
KLAUS F. STOFFEL
MARK A. FARLEY

WASHINGTON OFFICE

1725 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
TEL 202 437 7783
FAX 202 429 8919

*DCBAR
**CORRECTION BAR

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEETDATE: April 11, 2005NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVER: 4

TO:

NAME/COMPANY	FACSIMILE NO.	
Commissioner for Patents <u>Attn: Examiner Gentle E. Winter</u>	<u>1-571-273-1303</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESSFULLY FAXED
		<input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESSFULLY FAXED
		<input type="checkbox"/> SUCCESSFULLY FAXED

FROM: Max MoskowitzOFGS Serial No: 09/751,000FILE OFGS File: P/1596-51NO.: Inventor: HIRAE, Sadao et alTitle: SUBSTRATE TREATING METHOD AND APPARATUSAssignee: Dainippon Screen Mfg. Co., Ltd.**Per our phone conversation, please see attached copy letter.****IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL THE PAGES, PLEASE PHONE (212) 382-0700 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.**

This message is intended only for the use of the individual(s) to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address by mail. Thank you.

Proposed Amendment

9. A substrate treating apparatus for removing organisms from substrates, comprising:

support means including a chuck rotatable by a motor for supporting and spinning a substrate in a horizontal plane;

cleaning solution supply means including a nozzle with a discharge opening pointed to a spin center of said substrate, for supplying a cleaning solution having ozone dissolved in deionized water to an upper surface of said substrate;

ultraviolet emitting means including UV lamps and a reflector for emitting ultraviolet light toward said substrate, said ultraviolet emitting means emitting ultraviolet light in atmospheric condition from an irradiating position above said support means; and

a controller for controlling rotation of said support means, supply of said cleaning solution from said nozzle of said cleaning solution supply means, and supply of power to said UV lamps of said ultraviolet emitting means;

wherein said controller rotates said support means supporting said substrate, supplies said cleaning solution from said nozzle of said cleaning solution supply means to said spin center of said substrate supported, and, during this cleaning process, supplies power to said UV lamps to emit ultraviolet light to said cleaning solution forming a puddle on the upper surface of said substrate.

25. A substrate treating apparatus for removing photoresist film from a substrate by supplying a treating solution thereto, comprising:

support means including a chuck rotatable by a motor for supporting and spinning a substrate in a horizontal plane;

treating solution supply means including a nozzle with a discharge opening pointed to a spin center of said substrate, for supplying a treating solution having ozone dissolved in deionized water to an upper surface of said substrate;

ultraviolet emitting means including UV lamps and a reflector for emitting ultraviolet light toward said substrate, said ultraviolet emitting means emitting ultraviolet light in atmospheric condition from an irradiating position above said support means; and

a controller for controlling rotation of said support means, supply of said treating solution from said nozzle of said treating solution supply means, and supply of power to said UV lamps of said ultraviolet emitting means;

wherein said controller rotates said support means supporting said substrate, supplies said treating solution from said nozzle of said treating solution supply means to said spin center of said substrate supported, and, during this film removing process, supplies power to said UV lamps to emit ultraviolet light to said treating solution forming a puddle on the upper surface of said substrate.

38. A substrate treating apparatus for cleaning substrates by removing organisms therefrom, comprising:

a support rotatable by a motor for supporting and spinning a substrate;

a cleaning solution supply having a nozzle with a discharge opening pointed to a spin center of said substrate, for supplying a cleaning solution having ozone dissolved in deionized water to an upper surface of said substrate;

an ultraviolet emitter that emits ultraviolet light in atmospheric condition toward the upper surface of said substrate from an irradiating position above said support; and

a controller for controlling rotation of the support, supply of said cleaning solution from said nozzle of said cleaning solution supply, and supply of power to said ultraviolet emitter;

wherein said controller rotates said support supporting said substrate, supplies said cleaning solution from said nozzle of said cleaning solution supply to said spin center of said substrate supported, and, during this cleaning process, supplies power to said ultraviolet emitter to emit ultraviolet light to said cleaning solution forming a puddle on the upper surface of said substrate.

SUGITANI PATENT OFFICE

Nishitenma No.11 Matsuya Building.

10-8, Nishitenma 1-chome, Kita-ku,

OSAKA 530-0047 JAPAN

Telefax: 06-6363-3574

Telephone: 06-6363-3573

Patents, Utility
Models, Designs &
Trade Marks
Patent Attorney:
Tsutomu Sugitani

(BY FAX)

March 31, 2005

OSTROLENK, FABER
GERB & SOFFEN

MAR 31 2005

RECEIVED

Mr. Max Moskowitz
Ostrolenk, Faber, Gerb & Soffen, LLP
1180 Avenue of The Americans, New York,
New York 10036-8403
U.S.A

Re : U.S. Patent Appln. S.N. 09/751,000

By: HIRAE et al.

Your Ref.: P/1596-51

Our Ref.: P00-07-1US

Dear Mr. Moskowitz:

Regarding the Office Action in the above-identified application, please
proceed along the following lines:

1. Please hold an interview with the Examiner to see if the amended claims
attached hereto are effective against rejection. Please obtain a one-month
extension for response.

2. Please consider the following points in time of the interview:

(1) "Whether the claims recite the feature of emitting ultraviolet light to a
cleaning solution having ozone dissolved in the deionized water" as stated in the
Examiner's response to our previous arguments.

(2) "Whether the claims clearly define the structural features" as the
apparatus according to the present invention.

Very truly yours,

T. Sugitani
Tsutomu Sugitani
Patent Attorney